DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 455 700 FL 026 844

AUTHOR	Moore, Helen
TITLE	Language Policies as Virtual Realities: Two Australian Examples.
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	24p.; Chapter Three in: Thomas Ricento, Ed., Ideology, Politics & Language Policies: Focus on English IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society 6. Slightly revised version of "Language Policies as Virtual Reality: Two Australian Examples, " TESOL Quarterly, 30:3, Autumn 1996: 473-497.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; English Only Movement; *English (Second Language); Federal Legislation; Foreign Countries; Immigrants; *Language Attitudes; Language Minorities; Limited English Speaking; *Policy Formation; *Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia

ABSTRACT

This chapter uses the insights of Dorothy Smith and Anna Yeatman, both feminist scholars, to explore the nature of policy formation through two examples from Australia. Smith and Yeatman argue that all description is both biased and interested. The article documents how the values of pluralism and equity were not served well by Australian policy developments in the early 1990s. It also uses case study material to analyze this language policy. Why and how Australian language policy changed so significantly is also discussed. The policies in question are the National Policy on Languages and its replacement by the Australian Language and Literacy Policy. It is argued that the later policy did little but eliminate the previous political commitment to pluralism. (Contains numerous scholarly references and 13 notes.) (KFT)

ED 455 700

CHAPTER 3

Language Policies as Virtual Realities

Two Australian Examples

Helen Moore
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto

> ... with something of the archangelic manner he told her how he had undertaken to show (what indeed had been attempted before, but not with that thoroughness, justice of comparison, and effectiveness of arrangement at which Mr. Casaubon aimed) that all the mythical systems or erratic mythical fragments in the world were corruptions of a tradition originally revealed. Having once mastered the true position and taken firm footing there, the vast field of mythical constructions became intelligible, nay, luminous with the reflected light of correspondences. But to gather in this great harvest of truth was no light or speedy work. (George Eliot, *Middlemarch*)

> I have been working against an enemy that I was also part of, to discover how it worked so that I could discover how I was, and am, tied in to the relations of ruling in my practices of thinking about and speaking about people ... Renouncing such methods of speaking and writing is not just a matter of a personal transformation. (Dorothy Smith, *The Conceptual Practices of Power*)

1. Introduction

Mr. Casaubon, a fictional 19th Century theologian, and Dorothy Smith, a real live sociologist, illustrate differences in scholarly enquiry. Mr. Casaubon seeks, by process of comprehensive description, mastery of "the true position" which illuminates his "vast field" of investigation. Smith interrogates descriptions for their implication in "the relations of ruling" (Smith 1990a: 204).

Mr. Casaubon's belief that the truth resides in description persists in modern language planning studies. Cooper (1989) proposes that a comprehensive

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Helen Moore
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL026844

descriptive framework will lead towards a theory of language planning — what Yeatman would call an "origins myth" (1990: 149). But Smith requires a more probing stance. Along these lines, Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990), Phillipson (1992), Pennycook (1995) and Tollefson (1991, 1995) have engaged with seminal work in the social sciences (e.g., Foucault, Giddens, and Habermas) in considering power, the state, class and colonialism. As Luke et al. point out, avoiding these issues makes the study of language planning "the classic incarnation of a linguistics which is blind to the very networks of power through which it operates" (1990: 38).

In this chapter, I use insights from Dorothy Smith and Anna Yeatman, both feminist scholars, to explore the nature of policy formation, using two examples from Australia. Smith and Yeatman start with the premise that all description is partial and interested. My interests stem from my professional commitment to TESOL teacher education in Australia since 1975. My argument in this chapter is double-edged. I want to document how the interests I espouse — pluralism and equity — were not served well by policy developments in the early 1990s in Australia. I also want to demonstrate, using the Australian material as a case study, that conventional approaches to the analysis of language policy, as exemplified by Cooper (1989), are seriously deficient in the insights they offer into policy formation.

In the next section, I describe two language policies developed in Australia and ask why the first was replaced by a second. I then show that Cooper's approach offers no route into understanding this change. Next I use Smith's (1990a) analysis to explain why Cooper's approach fails and to consider how policy texts come about. Finally, I apply Yeatman's (1990) account of government "meta-policy" in Australia to show why language policy there has changed radically.

2. Two language policies in Australia

Australia is of interest for the study of language policy and planning because, unlike in many other countries, two explicitly designated language policies have been formulated at the federal level:[1] the National Policy on Languages (NPL) (Lo Bianco 1987) and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP) (Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1991). Explicitly designated language policies are not the same as policies that concern languages. Although Australia maybe unusual in having developed the former, almost all policies can have some bearing on languages. This raises the questions of why and how Australia's explicitly formulated policies came into being, what they

sought to achieve and why one replaced the other. The first two questions will be the main focus of this section.

A starting point is each policy's statement of goals. These statements set the frame for government action. They also encapsulate a policy document's "broad symbolic role as a public affirmation of the values" and the "social description" governments espouse (Lo Bianco 1991: 26). The NPL and ALLP documents were part of the social description used by the federal Labor government (1983–1996) in its response to linguistic and cultural diversity in Australia. The NPL assumed pluralism as a common social good that policy-making on languages would enhance. The ALLP prioritized literacy and "foreign" languages, using these to displace the NPL's commitments.

2.1 *The 1987 National Policy on Languages*

The NPL was adopted by the federal government in 1987. It was organized around four goals, described as (1) English for all (2) support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island languages, (3) a language other than English for all, and (4) equitable and widespread language services (Lo Bianco 1987). These goals were to be realized through four broad strategies: "the *conservation* of Australia's linguistic resources; the *development and expansion* of these resources; the *integration* of Australian language teaching and language use efforts with national economic, social and cultural policies; [and] the *provision* of information and services in languages understood by clients" (Lo Bianco 1987: 70, italics in the original). The policy document justified the NPL in terms of the need for government to support the potential of languages to provide cultural and intellectual enrichment for individuals and society, to offer opportunities for employment and trade, to overcome disadvantage and enhance social justice, and to promote the nation's external relations, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region (1987: 44).

In the Australian context, these aspirations were thoroughly pluralist. They proposed that the multiplicity of languages in Australia offered unique opportunities to develop a dynamic society.[2] Although English was acknowledged as the indisputable language of public life and was therefore seen as an important linguistic resource, it was framed as one language among many others.

Paradoxically, the argument for pluralism lay in showing commonalities across differences. All Australians were portrayed as both language users and potential learners, with all languages being reached by equally valid paths, creating different challenges for different people.

The NPL's aspirations embodied a fifteen-year history of policy responses to linguistic and cultural diversity that were couched in terms of commitments to

pluralism. The first major step was taken in 1972 with the election of a reformist federal Labor government led by Gough Whitlam.[3] Reacting against a period of more than 20 years of conservative rule, which had also included an extensive immigration program to meet demands for labour, the new government proclaimed multiculturalism as official policy. New buzzwords such as *strength in diversity* and *the family of the nation* announced pluralism as a social good. The government's commitments stemmed from and included greater access to politicians and bureaucrats for Aboriginal and immigrant organizations, and professionals connected with their education, welfare and legal status. Their advocacy was successful in establishing "programs of intervention targeted at particular groups for equity purposes", the main achievements in language education being in ESL for children and Aboriginal transitional bilingual programs (Lo Bianco 1988: 25–26). Whitlam's emphasis was on rights and redressing disadvantage (Lo Bianco 1988; Clyne 1991), themes and initiatives that the NPL incorporated in its social justice concerns.

In 1975, the Whitlam government was ignominiously sacked by the Governor General, following a constitutional crisis provoked by conservative outrage at its social policies and purported inability to manage the economy. However, on language matters, Whitlam's achievement was to oblige his conservative successor to attempt to gain the policy high ground. Narrowing its main response to linguistic and cultural diversity to immigrant issues (thereby excluding Aboriginal concerns), the incoming Fraser government sought to denaturalize immigrants' alliance with Labor by announcing the most comprehensive package of measures to that point (Galbally 1978). These included expansions in ESL, "community" languages, interpreter services and ethnic radio, and a new multicultural television service. Triennial funding for adult and child ESL ensured program stability, leading, in adult ESL, to an outstanding federally run teaching service and quality curriculum. The Fraser government reendorsed multiculturalism but shifted Whitlam's emphasis on rights to pluralism in the service of social cohesion (Foster and Stockley 1984; Lo Bianco 1988; Ozolins 1991, 1993). This view was central to the NPL.

While its response to Aboriginal concerns was weak, the Fraser government effectively brought about bipartisan agreement at the federal political level on broad directions in immigrant issues. Developed in different ways, the endorsement of linguistic and cultural pluralism had become fundamental to policies' social description. Paradoxically, the undisputed acceptance of English as the language of public life and institutions gave space to support for community languages on grounds of their benefits to individuals, their communities and hence the wider society (Lo Bianco 1988). Challenges to these assumptions were

marginalized and received no support at policymaking levels.[4] In ESL, research indicating the advantages of bilingualism and mother tongue literacy (e.g. Cummins 1978; Peal and Lambert 1962; Swain and Cummins 1979) became a cornerstone in teacher development and of advocacy to communities, bureaucrats and politicians. Leadership in the ESL profession rejected its previous assimilationist image and agenda and, in schools, promoted ESL as an aspect of bilingual children's development seen in the context of their other language(s). ESL professionals were among the most active in advocating bilingual programs, community languages in the mainstream curriculum, and linguistically and culturally inclusive practices in teaching and schools. The NPL document built on these notions of multilingualism and elaborated them.

The specific history of the NPL arose from this climate of expectation, activism and access to government during the 1970s and early 1980s. Ethnic and language-related professional associations directed incipient rivalries for attention and resources into a push for a national language policy. This strategy reflected what several policy scholars have called Australia's "statist political culture" in which "much political activity that elsewhere happens outside the state, in Australia occurs inside the state" (Lingard, Knight and Porter 1993: viii). Groups, such those with interests in languages, focus their claims in and around governments and the bureaucracy (Yeatman 1993), rather than, for example, the courts or the local community.

Lo Bianco (1990) and Ozolins (1993) describe the complex processes in the formation of the NPL that allowed "specific groups to perceive individual benefit in adhering to a broader constituency" (Lo Bianco 1990: 69). This constituency sought to extricate language issues, firstly, from being simply immigrant and/or welfarist policy (Ozolins 1991: 343), secondly, from "feel good" insubstantive multiculturalism, and thirdly, from antiracist policies, which seemed too politicized to command widespread support.[5] A policy focused on languages would resolve the previous contradictions that had excluded non-immigrant concerns. It appeared to offer a potentially coherent, substantive and positive response to linguistic and cultural diversity. This policy would encompass the dominant language — English — as a mother tongue and a second and foreign language, together with non-dominant languages, including "community", "foreign", Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, and the languages of the Deaf. It would affect domains such as education, interpreting and translating, libraries, the media, foreign relations, trade and exporting educational services (PLAN LangPol Committee, 1983). To draw these aspirations together, the proponents of a languages policy deployed the key notion of *languages as resources* in

achieving national enrichment and economic advantage. This was a strong theme in the NPL document.

This impetus led to a Senate Enquiry, begun in 1982 under Fraser and continued under the Hawke Labor government elected in 1983, a transition that was to prove crucial. In 1984, the Enquiry recommended in favour of a national language policy (Parliament of Australia 1984). However, the new government not only delayed acting on these recommendations but in 1986, took measures to trim the public sector, including community languages and ESL programs. Vigorous reactions by immigrant and professional groups and the forthcoming 1987 election persuaded the then-Education Minister to commission a consultant to prepare an implementation plan for the Senate recommendations. The NPL was negotiated in 1986–87 with State/Territory governments and other agencies. Featured as an election campaign promise, it was subsequently implemented as a 4-year program.

Action under the NPL was authorized as part of the brief of the newly designated Department of Employment, Education and Training (henceforth DEET) and was clearly more limited than its stated goals. The cuts to school ESL were not revoked, although tuition for newly arrived children was extended. Other provisions concerned languages other than English (particularly in primary schools), adult literacy, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, Asian studies in schools, and cross-cultural training. In the wake of the NPL, each State/Territory developed its own languages policy.

The NPL's major achievement was as a "social description" and a "public affirmation of values" (Lo Bianco 1991: 26). Through its construction of pluralism as a social good benefiting all, it not only met the aspirations of the diverse groups who had lobbied for and contributed to its development. It also articulated a coherent set of unifying principles on which future policy development and these groups' advocacy might jointly build.

2.2 *The 1991 Australian Language and Literacy Policy*

In 1991, the federal government replaced the National Policy on Languages with the Australian Language and Literacy Policy. The reasons for this can be portrayed in various ways, as will be seen below. The document, entitled *Australia's language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy* claimed the policy was "a continuation" (DEET 1991: xiii) of the NPL, suggesting that it resulted from the administrative process of reviewing NPL at the end of its four year funding cycle. The summary version of the ALLP goals reads as follows:

1. All Australians should develop and maintain effective literacy in English to enable them to participate in Australian society;
2. The learning of languages other than English must be substantially expanded and improved;
3. Those Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages that are still transmitted should be maintained and developed, and those that are not should be recorded where appropriate;
4. Language services provided by interpreters and translators, the print and electronic media and libraries should be expanded and improved.

(DEET 1991: 4)

These goals can be seen to reframe and atomize those of the NPL. Their implications were not immediately obvious. Clearer definition was provided by the DEET minister, whose hostility to the NPL had been undisguised since he had gained this office following the 1987 election. His speech to launch the ALLP emphasized coherence and the setting of priorities, which he saw as lacking in the NPL:

> This policy brings together a number of strands of policy that have been separately administered, separately put together in the past and now this is our attempt to try and make a coherent whole out of these various strands of policy and various programs. And the starting point is that Australia is a nation of many cultures but Australia has but one national language, that being Australian English. Despite the fact that that's a fairly uncontroversial statement, it remains the case that many Australians do not read and write English very well and many Australians do not even speak it. And that has, of course, enormous implications for those individuals in terms of their ability to participate in the education and training system and, perhaps as much as anything, their ability to participate in the wider life of the nation including its democratic institutions. (Dawkins 1991: 1)

The minister then moved to the need "to improve the rigour of English language teaching in schools" and measures to be taken in assessing literacy. He stressed "that English language education, English language training, is by far in a way the most important part of this policy document" (1991: 1). The government's second priority was "that more Australians should speak foreign languages" to enhance Australia's role "as a trading nation" (1991: 2). Prioritizing languages for special support would achieve the necessary "greater focus" (1991: 2).

Minister Dawkins' naming of language issues, carried through in all essential aspects in the policy document itself, marked a number of dramatic changes from the NPL and language policy formation since Whitlam. These are summarized in Table 1. However, despite the claim that separate policy strands

Table 1. *The differing perspectives of the National Policy on Languages and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy.*

Perspective	NPL	ALLP*
Expressed in title	*National Policy on Languages.* Uses pluralist "languages".	*Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy.* Strengthens nationalistic theme; displaces pluralist "languages" by ambiguous "language" (either English or language in general).
Language goals	Committed to broad pluralist goals; developed from a consensus-building process among diverse groups.	Claims to make separate "policy strands" "a coherent whole"; nominates priorities as literacy, assessment, and designated "foreign" languages; aims for ministerial and bureaucratic control.
Language and culture	Treats languages and cultures as irretrievably interlinked.	Contrasts Australia's "one national language" with its "many cultures", thus separating language from culture, and erasing the many languages associated with the "many cultures".
Language speakers	Proposes all Australians as knowers and learners of languages, distinguishing the paths by which different languages (and associated literacies) are developed.	Frames the main issue as lack of English; groups those who "do not read and write English very well" with those "who do not even speak it", thus conflating English literacy with second language development, and erasing literacies in other languages. Frames all language other than English as "foreign", i.e. separate from and alien to "Australians."
Importance of different languages	Articulates multiple values for languages; focuses on the potential of languages as "resources" in a variety of ways.	Foregrounds English and Asian languages; ties English literacy to education, training and employment; views not "speaking" English as a threat to democracy; ties Asian languages to trade. Generalizes and obscures the role of different languages by mythologizing the instrumental value of some (but not specifying what is included as "Asian"), obliterating others and demonizing the consequences of lack of English.

* Includes the interpretation of the DEET Minister as expressed in Dawkins (1991). Terms in quotation marks from Dawkins (1991).

would become "a coherent whole" (1991: 1), there was no proposal to bring the programs collected under the ALLP title within a single line of authority. In fact, the various bodies responsible became more difficult to locate or access. What the Minister meant was that his starting point — that Australia has "but one national language" (1991: 1) — would direct the work of these bodies.

The ALLP's main function was to eliminate the inclusiveness of the NPL by prioritizing "literacy", assessment and "foreign" languages. The actual

document provides an interesting example of an explicitly designated language policy that is largely inexplicit about the actual policy developments that followed its release. These included cuts to immigration quotas; course fees for intending immigrants tested as having less than "survival" English;[6] a radical change in the basis for funding adult ESL programs;[7] the near-elimination of child and adult ESL education as a policy, funding and curriculum category through its conflation with literacy (e.g. Coates et al. 1995);[8] cuts in school ESL programs due to States/Territories' diverting funds to off-set their overall reduced federal grants (Victorian Association of TESOL and Multicultural Education, 1993); and a decline in work on Aboriginal languages. A subsequent report (Council of Australian Governments, 1994), which prioritized Japanese, Mandarin, Indonesian and Korean as vital for trade, superseded the ALLP's mandate over languages other than English. In effect, pluralist aspirations no longer had a place in federally sponsored endeavours.

In 1991, few within language advocacy groups foresaw the developments that followed the launch of the ALLP. Nevertheless, there was intense anger and dismay at the ALLP's divisive prioritization of literacy and selected Asian languages, which erased the coherent and inclusive approach to languages that these groups had worked so hard to set in place.[9] It will be argued below that their success in establishing an explicit language policy committed to pluralism (viz. the NPL) had created the need to extricate government from the claims that this policy permitted. The ALLP's role was to replace a pluralist approach with one that set narrower priorities. This move eliminated explicit and coherent policy making about languages overall, and was successful in beginning the process of reversing expectations that any such policy was possible or desirable.

Why did such a dramatic change take place? Cooper (1989), Smith (1990a) and Yeatman (1990) offer various ways to approach this question. I will show that Cooper's pursuit of a complete descriptive schema leads nowhere. Smith's and Yeatman's work demonstrates the insights to be gained from less ambitious but better argued and contextually grounded analyses.

3. Cooper's path to explaining language policies

Following Cooper (1989), the replacement of the NPL by the ALLP would be best understood by describing each policy in terms of the following framework: what *actors* attempt to influence what *behaviours* of which *people* for what *ends* under what *conditions* by what *means* through what *decision-making process* with what *effect*? (see 1989: 98 for a full elaboration). Cooper claims that these

framing questions provide an "accounting" scheme that makes explicit and evaluates the central tasks of describing, predicting, explaining and theorizing in language planning.

An immediate issue is Cooper's assumption — not made explicit — that such description is unproblematic. For Cooper, the validity of a description is established by cross-verification:

> ... how is truthfulness in description to be judged? Probably the best solution is to ask a person who is familiar with the events to evaluate the validity of the description. For example, political scientists familiar with the early stages of the Ethiopian revolution could be asked to evaluate the truthfulness of my description of the Ethiopian mass-literacy campaign. (1989: 47)

But a number of questions are unanswered. For example, how do we decide on who/what were the actors, people, ends, behaviours and so on in the formation of the NPL and ALLP, and how might each be distinguished from the other? Cooper claims that these headings help in selecting and organizing "our observations from among the indefinitely large number of observations which could be made" and act "as a template which the investigator can use to impose order on his or her data and which the critic can use to evaluate the description" (1989: 47). In fact, without importing some other criteria for selecting what will be described, these headings set in train an endless and unmotivated task.

Other questions are equally unresolved. What might count as familiarity with events (and is Cooper implying that students of language planning need not be familiar with the events they describe)? Why should someone from another discipline be able to validate a description? What is to be done with different views of the same events? And are we to believe descriptions because they agree with each other? In place of answers to these questions, Cooper presents his descriptive framework using a combination of contradictions, arbitrariness and circular argument.

A central contradiction lies in Cooper's assumption that events manifest their own truth, at the same time as Cooper proposes a framework that constructs truths in terms of actors, people, ends and so on.[10] Arbitrariness occurs in the ways this framework is introduced and reified and its content selected, without justification, from innovation studies, marketing, politics and decision-making (Chapter 4). Much of this content (and associated imagery) appears to rely surreptitiously on experimental psychology as a research model. For example, explanatory adequacy is to be ascertained through the techniques of correlations, observations and experiments. In fact, these techniques exclude most explanations found in the language planning literature and could not answer why the ALLP replaced the NPL.

Circular arguments are used to justify the utility of descriptive frameworks. Most notably, Cooper claims that descriptive frameworks can contribute to theory-building: Descriptive frameworks nominate the variables to be described, leading to the discovery of "behavioral regularities" (1989: 57), which lead to theories, which tell us which variables should be described. Cooper's predilection for description leads to a catalogue of theories (see Chapter 8). In the face of their complexity, he asks "Is a theory of language planning possible?" (1989: 182). His answer is akin to Mr. Casaubon's realization that "to gather in this great harvest of truth is no light or speedy work." Cooper believes that "such a theory seems as far from our grasp as the philosopher's stone and the elixir of youth... unattainable at our present level of competence" (1989: 182). Because "to plan language is to plan society", "a satisfactory theory of language planning ... awaits a satisfactory theory of social change" (1989: 182). This circular argument justifies, one supposes, Cooper's descriptive approach for the foreseeable future.

Actual descriptions of policies, including my own above, demonstrate that these descriptions are not observations of events from which explanations unproblematically emerge. Rather, descriptions and explanations vary and, even when overlapping, may contradict each other. For example, Eggington (1993/94) and Ingram (1994) agree that the NPL was replaced, despite its strengths, because of its deficiencies. Both appear to assume that policy-making is a process whereby the weaknesses of one policy create the need for the next, whose own weaknesses inevitably lead to yet another. But their descriptions of strengths and weaknesses differ. Reviewing other literature, Eggington cites the NPL's "top-down" approach, narrow implementation, single authorship and a "narrow developmental base" as making it "vulnerable to severe revision" (1993/4: 139–141). The ALLP overcame these "weaknesses" through the discussion process and departmental consultations with "language planning experts", leading to revisions and facilitating its current acceptance (1993/4: 141–142), although by whom is not stated. In contrast, Ingram attributes the "need" (1994: 76) for the ALLP to the NPL's limited attention to literacy, the absence of on-going evaluation, its restriction to short-term program funding, and its lack of a framework to link analysis with implementation proposals. He does not explain how the ALLP was designed to rectify these problems. The ALLP's strengths are "some excellent and innovative ideas" (1994: 77), which, apart from its attent'on to assessment, he does not describe. In turn, the ALLP's weaknesses are its imbalance towards economic goals, its failure to include languages of "multicultural significance" and, like the NPL, its lack of a rigorous framework (1994: 76–77). Further variation can be found in assessments of the ALLP's significance. My account above paints it as a major shift in language policy,

which, to some extent, accords with Eggington's and Ingram's. In contrast, Lo Bianco (1991) and Clyne (1991) conclude that the ALLP largely preserved the NPL's directions.

These variations point to the problematic issue — passed over by Cooper — that descriptions are inevitably selective because they are interpretative. Eggington (1993/1994) does not mention the history, extensive consultation and consensus-building described by the consultant who authored the NPL (Lo Bianco 1990), whose account is the basis for my description above. What Eggington describes as consultation in the ALLP process, I interpret as co-option and coercion. I do not see the revisions to the ALLP document as substantive, but as strategic and trivial (see also Clyne 1991). Ingram presents as "unbalanced" (1994: 77) what I will argue below are crucial pointers to the ALLP's explanatory principles. His account of the NPL's weaknesses omits reference to the policy's extensive discussion of literacy issues and accompanying budget allocations, preferring the description of the NPL canvassed by Minister Dawkins and his advisors (see also Cavalier 1994). He fails to mention that NPL programs had a four-year funding cycle and that a progress report based on independent evaluations was publicly available within the first three years (Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, 1990). He did not point out that the ALLP was funded on an annual basis and that evaluations did not appear to be publicly accessible.

Decisions about what will be described are always taken in the context of an argument — whether overt or covert, coherent or incoherent — that the describer is making. Eggington (1993/1994) aims to review literature he considers relevant to an international survey of language planning. Ingram seeks to demonstrate to fellow academics and policy makers the need for his own "rational framework" (1994: 79, 85ff.). Clyne (1991) and Lo Bianco (1990) seem strategically oriented to downplaying the effects of the ALLP and to maintaining the NPL's aspirations. One of my principle motivations is similarly strategic, in that I wish to offer an understanding of what I interpret as a retrograde turn in policy-making in Australia, to highlight its effects and maybe provide some ground for change. Cooper's headings could not help evaluate our descriptions, and cross-validation by other analysts would inevitably rely on their motivations in structuring what is selected, omitted and interpreted.

What a describer chooses to describe, how it is described and what interpretations are made are all problematic. The differences above bring to light the interestedness of describers of language policies in what they describe and what their descriptions can produce, both in the academy and policy-making arenas. Our interestedness as scholars inevitably influences our choice and interpretation

of data, the arguments to which our descriptions contribute, and the values that our analyses embody. As I argue below using Smith (1990a), this interestedness cannot be dismissed as something extraneous or improper to scholars. Scholars must be interested in something, otherwise they would not embark on their work in the first place. The question is not whether scholars are interested, but what they are interested in.

A crucial issue for policy scholars is how they are situated in relation to the state. In Cooper's accounting scheme, the assumption of scholarly objectivity leaves language planning analysts in positions that are multiple, confused and never explicit. Sometimes they are initiators of policies and experiments in planning (1989: 48–56), sometimes the evaluators of others' work (1989: 49). How or why this comes about is never made clear, nor are its effects. This lack of clarity provides evidence for Smith's (1990a) argument below that the ethic of objectivity obscures the interests that scholars and state authorities have in each other's descriptions.

If scholars, like everyone else, always have interests in what they do, we might ask whether they offer anything special or different. Cooper's (1989) answer suggests endless description, pseudo-scientific methods and grand theory, all in the name of objectivity. An alternative is that, coherently and reflexively, scholars develop and probe the bases of their own and others' understandings. Smith (1990a) and Yeatman (1990) provide examples of this type of scholarship to which I now turn.

4. Smith: Interestedness and policy texts

Smith's extensive work (e.g. 1987, 1990a, 1990b) includes exploration of a fundamental reality ignored by Cooper (1989):

> Knowing is always a relation between the knower and known. The knower cannot be collapsed into the known, cannot be eliminated; the knower's presence is always presupposed. To know is always to know on some terms, and the paradox of knowing is that we discover in its object the lineaments of what we know already. There is no other way to know than humanly, from our historical and cultural situation. This is a fundamental human condition.
> (Smith 1990a: 33)

The knower's presence cannot be eliminated but it can be obscured in two ways. Firstly, researchers obscure their presence as knowers by separating their work from their personal experiences, interests, values and beliefs: We are trained "to discard our personal experience as a source of reliable information about the

character of the world and to confine and focus our insights within the conceptual frameworks and relevances of our discipline" (1990a: 15). Secondly, researchers treat other people as objects to be examined and classified and whose subjectivities and agency are discounted. Retaining (but disguising) the privilege of agency for themselves as authorized (but limited) by their discipline, researchers create and maintain their frameworks and theories by separating what "people say from the actual circumstances in which it is said, from the actual empirical conditions of their lives, and from the actual individuals who said it" (1990a: 43). Objectivity bestows agency on researchers' frameworks, while researchers and the researched become simply their different representatives (1990a: 49). These frameworks can be seen to "work", because, beyond them, there is always "an actual co-ordering of activities that is reflected in them" (1990a: 49). Thus Cooper's accounting scheme will "work" if researchers co-order their descriptions in terms of "actors" influencing people's "behaviours" (1989: 98), and because policies do affect people.

Cooper (1989), Ingram (1994) and Eggington (1993/1994) assume that objectivity produces disinterested knowledge, which is therefore credible. Smith (1990a) shows that objectivity does not equate with disinterestedness, and credibility rests on neither. Objectivity is "a convention of the profession requiring that the presence of the subject and the subject's interest in knowing be cancelled from the 'body of knowledge' as a condition of its objective status" (1990a: 33). Rather than being necessarily concerned with the development of "knowledge" or "truth", the practices of objectivity are committed to their self-extension, namely, to "the constitution of a phenomenal world and a body of statements about it" (1990a: 33). Smith argues, using Marx, that researchers produce "ideological circles" (1990a: 49) if they disguise and further their interests by using human experiences to produce and maintain their own procedures, descriptions and theoretical edifices. Cooper's (1989) accounting scheme is a particularly clear example. Its effect is precisely to reduce knowing, acting subjects to objects for classification under its headings.[11] Its main purpose, as he repeatedly illustrates, is its own self-maintenance and extension.

Smith seeks practices that, as she writes in the epigraph to this chapter, renounce what she critiques. Her alternative begins with and always honours "insider's knowledge", that is, how individuals describe and explain the actualities of their lives (1990a: 24). This focus should not be confused with promoting subjectivist interpretations, or rejecting evidence, careful analysis and argument: A concern with the "self as sole focus and object" would perpetuate the very problems Smith seeks to investigate (1990a: 27). Starting with insiders' perspectives, Smith uses her scholarly knowledge and skills to explore "the relations

beyond our direct experience that shape and determine it" (1990a: 27), particularly how people's lives are brought under the control of the state in "the relations of ruling" (1990a: 204). But insiders are not simply providers of data. Their interests and insights, as well as the researcher's, contribute to a dynamic dialogic process from which both may gain.

Smith's "insider's knowledge" (1990a: 24) of her own profession of sociology is the basis of her exploration of objectivity and its implication in "the relations of ruling" (1990a: 204). She starts by noting how:

> Sociologists ... move among the doings of organizations, government processes, and bureaucracies as people who are at home in that medium. The nature of that world itself, how it is known to them, the conditions of its existence, and their relation to it are not called into question. Their methods of observation and inquiry extend into it as procedures that *are essentially of the same order as those that bring about the phenomena they are concerned with* [italics added]. Their perspectives and interests may differ, but the substance is the same. (1990a: 16–17).

As with her previous account of objectivity, Smith's alternative order of description focuses on people's practices. The modern state requires practices that produce "facticity" (1990a: 69). For Smith, "facts are neither the statements themselves, nor the actualities those statements refer to" (1990a: 71). Rather:

> They are *an organization of practices of inscribing an actuality into a text* [italics added] of reading, hearing, or talking about what is there, what actually happened and so forth. They are ... properties of a discourse or other organization mediated by texts. ... In scientific contexts, the facticity of statements is guaranteed by generally highly technical procedures that can reliably and precisely produce the state of affairs or events expressed in factual statements. The facticity of statements thus arises from *their embedding in distinctive socially organized processes* [italics added]. (1990a: 71)

Crucial to facticity is that texts are written and read without attention "to what has gone into ... [their] making" (1990a: 107). Thus a factive text exists in textual — as opposed to real — time and "has no apparent history other than that incorporated in it" (1990a: 74). The practices on which objectivity relies — the erasure of the relation between the knower and the known — also operate in producing factive texts. A common interest in the production and use of these texts creates a symbiotic relationship between state authorities and social scientists. This insight points to the core of the blindness in Cooper's (1989) assumption that description is non-problematic, and to the problem that we saw Luke et al. (1990) diagnose generally in language planning studies.

For both social scientists and state authorities, this organization of practices makes factive texts "virtual realities", that is, "the account comes to stand for the actuality it claims to represent" (Smith 1990a: 74). Whereas social scientists use facts in their creation of frameworks and theories, state authorities require facts as the basis for what is "properly actionable" (1990a: 125). Examples of state-produced factive texts are population data, hospital and school records, and policy documents. These are the realities by which state authorities act, not people's everyday accounts of their lives.

The practices that bring facts into existence are likewise directed to maintaining them. Specific procedures allow "an organization ... [to] virtually invent the environment and objects corresponding to its accounting terminologies and practices", so that if something cannot "be resolved into the appropriate terminology, it cannot gain currency within the system" (1990a: 96, 100). Particular institutions have their own procedures that "warrant" and "enforce" how texts are constructed, read and understood, who is capable of reading and understanding, and how people are trained in doing this (1990a: 73). These procedures are hierarchically organized. They insulate those who mandate the production of factive texts from those closest to "local historical experience", which has the potential to disrupt how a factive text is constructed or read (1990a: 96). The subordinate status of those closest to "the lived situation" — those actually making particular records and reports — prevents them from challenging, and ensures they actively maintain, the way factive texts mandate realities (1990a: 100).[12]

As is clear from the epigraph to this chapter, Smith places herself with those who are ruled, not those who rule. She does not dispute that factive texts are necessary for the business of the state and other authorities. Her scholarly interests lie in contributing to an understanding of how people's lives are caught up in this business. If desired, these insights can provide agendas for struggle and change in specific contexts. Applied to the study of policy texts, her approach requires that we do not "take for granted as known" the entities and processes on which these texts rely (1990a: 17). Rather, we should examine how policy texts select and produce virtual realities that authorize particular lines of action by state authorities. In considering the NPL and the ALLP documents, we must go behind their portrayal of the inevitability of their views and their obliteration of the struggles experienced by insiders to their production and those whom they affect (see also Luke et al. 1993; Kress 1985; Lemke 1990; Yeatman 1990: 167). Instead we should ask: How they have produced, warranted and enforced their virtual realities?

The contrast between the NPL and the ALLP shows that their realities are anything but inevitable. These realities were produced from on-going and shifting

struggles over how Australian governments should respond to linguistic and cultural diversity, not the inevitable march of progress, as Ingram (1994) and Eggington (1993/1994) would have us believe. As I have portrayed it, the NPL created a policy reality whose purpose was to bring together the efforts of groups struggling with and close to this diversity. Its history and formation drew from the understandings of these groups, and produced principles for state action that they found acceptable. The ALLP was produced to establish new realities drawn from completely other sources. Yeatman (1990) offers an account of how these realities gained ascendance and why they proved so hostile to the pluralism espoused by the NPL.

5. Consensus politics versus pluralism

Like Smith, Yeatman (1990, 1994) rejects objectivity's "archimedean" judgments (1990: 149) and seeks reflexivity in her own and others' work, particularly in attending to how it intervenes in the constitution and distribution of power relations (1990: 174; 1994: 27–41). She is committed to promoting "the surfacing of claims" and "debate and struggle" over their distribution (1990: 174). Her view of state texts is also similar to Smith's: Policies "are not responses to social problems already formed and 'out there'" but rather "constitute the problems to which they are seen to be responses" (1990: 158).

Yeatman describes modern democratic political activity as a "discoursal politics", that is, a struggle over what is to be named (or nameless) and thereby constituted (or disqualified) as "subject to state agency or intervention" (1990: 153, 155). As we have seen, the NPL named linguistic and cultural diversity as a social good that policy-making would develop towards cultural, economic, social justice and foreign policy goals. The NPL ran headlong into political processes that constructed pluralism as a problem.

These processes — popularly known as *consensus politics* — were central to the Labor government's strategy in gaining and retaining office (1983–1996). Its 1983 mandate was to reverse youth unemployment, strikes and poor economic performance. To achieve this, Labor's traditional relationships with the unions were complemented by a new openness to co-operation with big business. Formal agreements between government and the unions reduced strikes and wage demands, in return for improved conditions, lower inflation and growing employment. Consensus politics named its realities in terms of what Yeatman, using Beilharz (1987), describes as "the discourse of labourism" (1990: 158). Drawn from traditional Marxism (but dispensing with its oppositions), this discourse

naturalizes the interests and understandings of unions, employers and the state, constructing these as producers of policy (1990: 158). Throughout the 1980s, representatives of these power elites were privileged in policy bodies, while other groups were progressively eliminated (Lingard, Knight and Porter 1993: viii). So, for example, following the 1987 election, "corporate managerialist" principles were used to restructure the renamed and enlarged Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET), giving its minister and his senior advisors greater power (Considine 1988; Yeatman 1990). Its semi-autonomous policy-making bodies, which included representation from parent, educational and community groups, were replaced by advisory committees dominated by those privileged in the "consensus", namely, businessmen, unionists and bureaucrats.

This policy elite set "economic restructuring" as Labor's "metapolicy", that is, "the policy framework within which all other specific policy challenges are to be located" (Yeatman 1990: 102–3). Economic restructuring aimed to reduce trade deficits and overseas debt, and expose Australian industry to international competition. The government removed tariffs, deregulated financial markets, cut taxes, reduced the public sector, and attempted to promote efficiency and skills in industry, training and education. These policies were intensified in the late 1980s and early 1990s in response to recession, worsening trade balances and a return to high unemployment. Common in much of the industrialized world, such policies are frequently described as emanating from New Right ideology or "economic rationalism", which Marginson defines as "a form of political rationality in which (paradoxically) the market economy is substituted for democratic politics and public planning as the system of production and co-ordination and as the origin of social ethics" (1992: 1; see also Pusey 1991).

Where Australia was distinctive under Labor was in the articulation of economic rationalism with labourism. This precluded the extreme market-oriented policies developed in the USA and Britain, and required "social justice" for "disadvantaged groups." However, by the late 1980s, the economic rationalist ethic had colonized "social justice." A central policy document, *Towards a Fairer Australia: Social Justice Under Labor* proclaims that: "The government ... is committed to making social justice both a primary goal of economic policy and an indispensable element in achieving economic policy objectives" (1988: vi–vii, cited in Fitzclarence and Kenway 1993: 91). The new DEET Minister was a key producer of this ideology. As Taylor and Henry describe:

> The clear emphasis in Dawkins' approach ... was that education must be part of a skills-led economic recovery. Equity concerns were peripheral in these policies and where 'disadvantaged groups' were targeted for attention they were seen primarily in terms of wastage of human resources. (1994: 109)

Yeatman describes social justice policies as being "specifically for those whom labourist discourse excludes from mainstream modes of participation and distribution" and "a strategy which maintains, and even *develops* ... the exclusions which are built into the dominant labourist discourse" (1990: 158, italics in original). These exclusions allowed the policy elite to both maintain its control and limit others' claims to policy benefits. In Smith's terms, social justice policies created "an ideological circle" (1990a: 49) that perpetuated and obscured the interests of their producers, while eliminating the agency of those at whom the policies were directed. This was precisely the effect of reconstituting the NPL's inclusive "English for all" as "literacy" for the "disadvantaged" (see Table 1). "Language and literacy" (in English) — the authorized policy category that subsumed ESL — devalued and misrepresented the languages and literacies of ESL learners, obscured the needs of English mother tongue speakers, disrupted and divided teachers, and pressured the ESL profession to return to the assimilationist thinking that its leaders had struggled so hard to replace.

Within both the neo-Marxist and right-wing interests privileged by "consensus politics", there was also outright hostility to the NPL's pluralism. Aspirations for immigrant language maintenance were aligned with fanatical "ethnic" groups (supposedly let out of control by Whitlam's irresponsibility) and the spectre of ghettos and social collapse. In place of pluralism and diversity, Labor celebrated its traditional 19th century ethos of mateship, "fellow Australians" and "true believers" (for example, Cavalier 1994). By the end of the 1980s, the NPL's commitments were side-stepped except on occasions specifically soliciting "ethnic" votes, where weak assurances were given (Ozolins 1991: 348). Immigrant representation in mainstream policy bodies had disappeared. Policy-making on languages other than English was directed to what Minister Dawkins had named as "Australians" learning "Asian languages" (1991: 2) — meaning four such languages — thereby confusing and dividing schools and communities. These programs did not target the skills and needs of native speakers of these languages. Rather, the minister's sentiment that those who cannot "even speak" English are unproductive burdens and threats to democracy (1991: 1) gained considerable vitality in the public arena (see note 5).

In the public sector, such as education and social services, economic rationalist assumptions made private sector activity both a goal to be served and an operational norm (Yeatman 1990: 32). Corporate managerialism instituted goals that centred on "economy, efficiency and effectiveness" (1990: 27). "Cost efficiency" became value-free "objective necessity", reducing other values to matters of personal viewpoint (1990: 32). Incentives to meet these goals were combined with devolved responsibility for policy implementation (within generally

reduced budgets) to local sites (1990: 11). These changes created a sophisticated system of top-down controls that rewarded loyalty to management objectives, excluding other demands by emphasizing "technique" (1990: 9). The effect of these controls was, as Yeatman describes, "to offset and limit the influence of 'content', namely, commitments and loyalties which are tied to particular departmental or agency portfolios and which acquire authority through the development of specialized experience and links with client groups" (1990: 9). I have described above how the content of the NPL was generated through access to politicians and bureaucrats by advocates from local communities, service and educational providers, Aboriginal, immigrant and professional groups. Such networks are themselves necessarily pluralist and help constitute pluralist policies. The corporatist ideological circle in the public service cut off and circumscribed the knowledge produced by these networks, making their claims objects of suspicion.

The post-1987 DEET became an exemplar of corporate managerialist processes and economic rationalist policies. DEET named its realities in terms of "accountability" and training in "competencies." For Minister Dawkins and his department, the NPL represented an annoying remnant of earlier times with which they had been saddled as a result of "ethnic" pressures during the close 1987 election. The NPL had succeeded in naming languages as an object of policy-making, so now they would be reconstituted in the ALLP to serve economic restructuring: (Some) Asian languages would meet overseas trade objectives and literacy would focus on skills upgrading and social justice without allowing pluralist claims to surface. Those who did not accept this selectivity and reductionism were eliminated from consultation mechanisms. In this way, the ALLP produced and enforced the ideological circle of DEET metapolicy.

In adult ESL, arguably the country's greatest achievement in quality language education, DEET promulgated the reality that the program was an expensive luxury serving the interests of its teachers (for career paths, quality curriculum and stable programs). The economic rationalist belief that market principles increased cost efficiency became the unassailable rationale for replacing triennial funding with competitive contracting and admitting private sector organizations (for example, secretarial schools) as ESL providers. The dynamic of competition divided providers, and weakened their ability to understand, articulate and mobilize their claims (Yeatman 1990: 42), destroying previous infrastructure, professional standards, and advisory and cooperative networks. It strengthened bureaucratic control and interventions in student selection and program management, and effectively installed DEET's preferred curriculum model of competency-based training (Moore 1996b). The new system

was a perfect example of the maintenance and enforcement of an ideological circle. DEET's factive texts enforced its virtual reality of "cost efficiency" by not documenting the time spent in preparing and assessing contract bids, and the almost daily negotiations between providers and DEET officials; nor did they reveal that classes were funded without students to fill them, while others were turned away, had courses discontinued or were not told they had places. As Smith (1990a) predicts, providers actively maintained DEET's virtual reality: Including this information in course reports would have jeopardized their chances with subsequent contracts.

The NPL's major achievement had been in framing language policy as a set of inter-related concerns, including economic ones, which diverse interests could jointly endorse and develop. Labor's consensus politics produced a power elite, whose ideology and processes could not tolerate pluralism: The NPL had to be replaced precisely because it rested on different interests and understandings. The new policy regime had no place for seeking consensus with anyone outside the alliance who had constructed its virtual realities. The ALLP announced to those working within the NPL's assumptions that their concerns were important only insofar as they could be co-opted into the goals constructed, consensually agreed (more or less) and pursued by government, its unionist and big business colleagues, and the senior bureaucracy.

The power of the ALLP's categories and processes in determining programs, curriculum and assessment, and research agendas — and the results of these — were felt in all post-1991 developments in languages. The NPL assumption of diversity as both norm and social good tapped the potential of cooperative and purposeful efforts, whereas the ALLP's priorities generated conflict, confusion and waste. The state's factive procedures ensured that the latter remained undocumented, while protecting those whose interests were furthered by the ideological circles of consensus politics.

6. Conclusion

As explicit language policies — or factive state texts — the NPL and the ALLP constructed very different realities. The NPL's sources lay in realities known to language users and educators. Their aspirations were supported by its processes and embodied in its content. The ALLP's reality lay with bureaucratic interpretations of the economic and political imperatives proclaimed by a powerful elite of government, business and trade union leaders.

Economic rationalist policy solutions to the social and economic challenges

facing Australia have yet to prove themselves. Throughout the 1990s the nation continued to struggle with large scale unemployment and poor trade balances. It is hard to see how the ALLP contributed to economic growth, its stated rationale. However, at the federal level it successfully eliminated comprehensive and explicit language policy making, together with commitments to pluralism, from the political map.[13] In 1996, the incoming Liberal-National coalition abolished the ALLP's programs. However, its legacy continued in the form of an even more narrowly focused policy on English literacy for children in the early years of schooling (DEETYA 1998). The euphoric promotion of Asian languages (based on dashed assumptions about booming Asian economies' utility in rescuing the Australian economy) was silenced. Meanwhile, the paranoia set loose by images of disadvantaged immigrants and their dysfunction in English gave permission for overt racism in the political arena and its consequent escalation in many public and private domains. Although the public understandings achieved by the NPL now seemed almost anachronistic, the need to recapture them was never more urgent.

No doubt, the account above could be re-arranged under Cooper's (1989) headings. This would yield what Smith describes as an investigation "aimed primarily at itself" (1990a: 22). In contrast, my hope is that this analysis, including the argument for more reflexive approaches, enlarges the possibilities for understanding both the Australian example and others in the field.

Acknowledgments

This chapter is a slightly revised version of "Language Policies as Virtual Reality: Two Australian Examples", which first appeared in *TESOL Quarterly*, 30: 3, Autumn 1996: 473–497. Reprinted with permission.

Notes

1. Australia is a federation consisting of six States and two Territories. The federal government is known as "the Commonwealth". Because the Commonwealth holds most taxing powers, it has considerable leverage over the States/Territories. Policy documents, such as those discussed here, are used to set out Commonwealth government priorities and programs, and to attempt to harness the States/Territories' cooperation.
2. The NPL documented 17.3% (2,404,600) of the Australian population (total 16 million) speaking a first language other than English (1983 figures) (Lo Bianco 1987).
3. Three major parties contend for federal office as a Westminster-style cabinet government: the Australian Labor Party (ALP), which has a strong union power base, and the conservative

Liberal Party in coalition with the National Party (formerly the Country Party). In this chapter 'Labor' refers to the ALP (in a spelling determined by the party), whereas 'labour' is the spelling otherwise adopted.

4. See Ozolins (1993) for a detailed account of these challenges.

5. In 1998, a blatantly racist party (called One Nation) gained prominence and, having won seats in the Queensland State parliament, appeared to threaten a serious erosion of the major parties' support in the federal elections. In the event, it did not succeed. However, one consequence was anti-racist education initiatives by the (conservative) federal government and also by some States.

6. In 1996, the tuition fee was $4,000 for the main applicant and $2,000 for dependents. It was not levied on refugees.

7. Before 1992, the Commonwealth directly funded its own adult ESL teaching service and also signed 3-year contracts (subject to annual review) with other providers. These programs were administered by the department responsible for immigration. In the early 1990s, eligibility for these programs was restricted to new arrivals with low levels in English (most of whom paid the tuition fee — see note 6). This move considerably reduced the number of these programs, which were subsequently allocated by competitive contracting procedures, open to public and private bodies. Other adult ESL provision, which was expanded, came within "labour market training programs" administered by DEET. Regional offices developed course specifications to meet what each office determined as client needs (based on local unemployment patterns) and advertised for bids (from anyone), initially on a 6-month basis. The subsequent chaos persuaded DEET to adopt longer funding cycles and to institute a provider registration system. In 1996, when the Liberal-National coalition came to office, they abolished labour market programs and hence their ESL programs.

8. See Moore (1996a) for an analysis of this process in ESL assessment in schools.

9. The discussion paper leading to the ALLP generated unprecedented opposition, including 340 submissions written over 3 months, 2 of which were the Christmas/summer break. No submission favouring the ALLP was ever identified (Clyne 1991).

10. See Bowe, Ball & Gold (1992) and Burchell, Gordon & Miller (1991) for critiques of policy in these terms. Rubin (1986) makes a similar criticism specifically in the context of language planning.

11. Cooper's account of the mass literacy campaign in Ethiopia concludes with the remark that "If Haile Sillase could view the present scene, he could, perhaps, be forgiven an ironic smile" (1989: 28). Cooper's perspective permits this distanced and callous comment, which makes the actualities of those people's extraordinary suffering irrelevant.

12. Smith gives an example from the Vietnam War (1990a: 99). Those ordering bombing raids devised reporting procedures based on their previous knowledge of warfare. Subordinates followed these procedures, ignoring the considerable differences from their experiences of actual raids.

13. The Victorian State Liberal government continued to vigorously assert its commitments to linguistic and cultural pluralism.